

***REMARKS***

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action of June 21, 2007.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 5-13, 17-21, and 25-48 are pending in this application. Claim 12 has been amended. Claims 2-4, 14-16, and 22-24 are canceled. The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the amendments and that a new search is not necessary.

Applicants appreciate the Office noting that claims 1, 5-11, 21, 29-42, and 48 are in condition for allowance.

***CLAIMS***

**Claim 12**

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 103(a) as purportedly being obvious or anticipated by Cousin et. al. (U.S. Patent 4,554,181) and Nigram (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0087112, as discussed in the Office Action. Applicants traverse each of the 102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action and submit that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 103 by Cousin and Nigram should be withdrawn because Cousin and Nigram, individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 12. In particular, Cousin and Nigram do not teach, disclose, or suggest that “the substrate is selected from printing paper, writing paper, drawing paper, and photobase paper ...the cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof includes at least two monomer units described by structural formula (I) (shown above), wherein R1 is selected

from hydrogen and a lower alkyl and R2 is selected from hydrogen, an alkyl, an alkoxy, and a hydroxyl-substituted alkoxy”, as recited in claim 12.

As described in detail below, the Office has not satisfied its *prima facia* case. The Office Action notes that Cousin does not teach cationic guanidines having monomer units described by formula I (shown above). The Office Action attempts to cure this deficiency using the teachings of Nigram, which the Office asserts teaches cationic guanidines having monomer units described by formula I. It should be noted that Cousin and Nigram are in a different field of endeavor. In particular, Cousin is in the field of endeavor of paper-based or photo-based print media, while Nigram is in the field of endeavor of textiles. One skilled in the art of solving problems in paper-based or photo-based print media would not look to fields of endeavor dealing with textiles, which do not have the problems that are associated with paper-based or photo-based print media. The chemistry of the fields are very different and must consider different variables due to the nature of the substrate material, use of the material, and the like. Thus, Cousin and Nigram should not be used as references in the rejection of claim 12. Therefore, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 13, 17-20, and 25-28**

Applicants traverse all of the §102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 13, 17-20, and 25-28 include every feature of independent claim 12 and that the cited references fail to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the features of claim 12. Thus, pending dependent claims 13, 17-20, and 25-28 are also allowable over the prior art of record. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**Claim 43**

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 103(a) as purportedly being obvious or anticipated by Cousin et. al. (U.S. Patent 4,554,181), as discussed in the Office Action. Applicants traverse each of the 102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action and submit that the rejection of claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 103 by Cousin should be withdrawn because Cousin does not teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 43. In particular, Cousin does not teach, disclose, or suggest that “the substrate is selected from printing paper, writing paper, drawing paper, and photobase paper …the cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof includes at least two monomer units described by structural formula (I) (shown above), wherein R1 is selected from hydrogen and a lower alkyl and R2 is selected from hydrogen, an alkyl, an alkoxy, and a hydroxyl-substituted alkoxy”, as recited in claim 43. It should be noted that the Office states that Cousin does not teach formula I (section 3, second paragraph). Therefore, the rejection of claim 43 should be withdrawn.

If the Office attempts to cure this deficiency using the teachings of Nigram, which the Office asserts teaches cationic guanidines having monomer units described by formula I, Applicants provide the following arguments. It should be noted that Cousin and Nigram are in different fields of endeavor. In particular, Cousin is in the field of endeavor of paper-based or photo-based print media, while Nigram is in the field of endeavor of textiles. One skilled in the art of solving problems in paper-based or photo-based print media would not look to fields of endeavor dealing with textiles, which do not have the problems that are associated with paper-based or photo-based print media. The chemistry of the fields are very different and must consider different variables due to the nature of the substrate material (fabric vs. paper), use of the material, and the like. Thus, Cousin and Nigram should not be used as references in the rejection of claim 43. Therefore, the rejection of claim 43 should be withdrawn.

**Claims 45-47**

Applicants traverse all of the §102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 45-47 include every feature of independent claim 43 and that the cited references fail to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the features of claim 43. Thus, pending dependent claims 45-47 are also allowable over the prior art of record. In re Fine.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

In addition, any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Christopher B. Linder, Reg. No. 47,751